

## REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 27, 2009. Claims 28-47 are presented for examination, of which Claims 28 and 38 are in independent form. Claims 28 and 38 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, at page 19, paragraph 45.<sup>1</sup> Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 28-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,917,969 (*Aggarwal et al.*) in view of a document entitled "Understanding JavaServer Pages Model 2 Architecture" (*Seshadri*), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039990 (*Bakar et al.*). For at least the following reasons, Applicants submit that independent Claims 28 and 38, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 28 is directed to a method for providing standardized input interface elements using Extensible Markup Language (XML). The method includes receiving a request for a webpage and a first file corresponding to the webpage. An XML tag that includes a field name is obtained from the first file and used to obtain a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name from a second file. The formatting instruction specifies an input interface element including at least one of: a button, a check box, a radio box, a text field, a menu, a list, and a drop-down box. Program code corresponding to the input interface element specified in the formatting instruction is formatted. The program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via

---

<sup>1</sup> Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

the input interface element. A third file including the program code corresponding to the input interface element is generated and transmitted using a communications network.

Notable features of Claim 28 include “using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name, wherein the formatting instruction specifies an input interface element including at least one of: a button, a check box, a radio box, a text field, a menu, a list, and a drop-down box” and “formatting program code corresponding to the input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element.” By virtue of these features, a system implementing the method of Claim 28 can provide standardized input interface elements. For example, using the method of Claim 28, the system can present multiple webpages through which a user can enter an annual income amount, where each webpage includes the same input interface element, *e.g.*, a text field that allows five digits to be entered. That is, the method of claim 28 can prevent the system from presenting a first web page that includes a text field that allows five digits to be entered to specify the annual income, a second web page that includes a text field that allows six digits to be entered to specify the annual income, and a third web page that includes a drop-down box that allows a particular salary range to be selected to specify the annual income, for example. Accordingly, the method of claim 28 can be used to provide input interface elements that are consistent across related webpages.

*Aggarwal et al.* is understood to relate to cross-platform rendering of content in variable presentation environments (*see* col. 1, lines 8-10). Nothing has been found in *Aggarwal et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest that a formatting instruction corresponding to a field name is obtained, where the formatting instruction specifies an input interface element including

at least one of: a button, a check box, a radio box, a text field, a menu, a list, and a drop-down box.

*Seshadri* is understood to relate to a Model-View-Controller design for separating presentation from content using JavaServer Pages (JSP) (*see* Summary). Nothing has been found in *Seshadri* that is believed to remedy the deficiencies of *Aggarwal et al.* identified above.

*Bakar et al.* is understood to relate to an automated form and data analysis tool that provides mechanisms for developing, maintaining, and manipulating forms, and for extracting information from the forms (*see* paragraph 2). Nothing has been found in *Bakar et al.* that is believed to remedy the deficiencies of *Aggarwal et al.* identified above.

Applicants submit that a combination of *Seshadri*, *Aggarwal et al.*, and *Bakar et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest a method that includes “using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the field name, wherein the formatting instruction specifies an input interface element including at least one of: a button, a check box, a radio box, a text field, a menu, a list, and a drop-down box,” and “formatting program code corresponding to the input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element,” as recited in Claim 28. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 28 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claim 38 include features sufficiently similar to those of Claim 28 that Claim 38 is believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of independent Claims 28 and 38 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for responding to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/

---

Lock See Yu-Jahnes  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 4368509\_2